

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION - CINCINNATI**

TEVYN NEVADA LEE WILKINS,	:	Case No. 1:22cv18
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	Judge Matthew W. McFarland
	:	Magistrate Judge Karen L. Litkovitz
vs.	:	
	:	
SOUTHERN OHIO	:	
CORRECTIONAL FACILITY, et al.,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

---

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION (Doc. 7) AND  
TERMINATING CASE**

---

The Court has reviewed the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Karen L. Litkovitz (Doc. 7), to whom this case is referred pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). No objections have been filed. The time for filing such objections under Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) has expired.

As required by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b), the Court has made a de novo review of the record in this case. Accordingly, the Court orders as follows:

1. The Court **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation (Doc. 4) in its entirety.
2. Plaintiff's complaint is hereby **DISMISSED** with prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).
3. This action is hereby **TERMINATED** on the Court's docket.


4. The Court **CERTIFIES** pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a) that, for the reasons expressed in the Report, an appeal of this Order adopting the Report would not be taken in good faith, and therefore **DENIES** plaintiffs leave to appeal *in forma pauperis*. See *McGore v. Wrigglesworth*, 114 F.3d 601, 611 (6th Cir. 1997), overruled on other grounds, *Jones v. Bock*, 549 U.S. 199, 203 (2007). Plaintiffs remain free to apply to proceed *in forma pauperis* in the Court of Appeals. *Callihan v. Schneider*, 178 F.3d 800, 803 (6th Cir. 1999).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
JUDGE MATTHEW W. MCFARLAND